UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/780,810	02/09/2001	Yue Xing		8659

7590   07/12/2006

Abraham N. Seidman
LAW OFFICE OF ABRAHAM SEIDMAN & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 16603
Beverly Hills, CA 90209

EXAMINER
VO, HUYEN X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 September 2002</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-15,28-41 and 46-48</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) <u>16-27 and 42-45</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 September 2002</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1.   This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct

species: species 1 includes claims 28-38 and 46-48, while species 2 includes claims 16-

27 and 42-45. The species are independent or distinct because species 1 is drawn to

mapping of multi-lingual domain names or **URLs to existing domain names or URLs**

of an Internet network system, while species 2 is drawn to mapping multilingual **user**

IDs to existing user IDs of an Internet network system.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for

prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is

finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-15 and 39-41 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification

of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims

readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim

is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless

accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration

of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations

of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after

the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Abraham Seidman on 6/1/2006 a

provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of claims 1-15,

28-41, and 46-48. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to

this Office action. Claims 16-27 and 42-45 are withdrawn from further consideration by

the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Objections

2.   Claims 31 and 35 are objected to because of the following informalities: "ML-UID"

in line 2 of claim 31 and in step (d) of claim 35 should be amended to "ML-URL".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for
> patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States
> before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty
> defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the
> United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under
> Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1-7 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Abir (US 6738827).

5.   Regarding claims 1 and 28, Abir discloses a method for mapping multi-lingual

(non-English) domain names to existing domain names of an internet network system

comprising the steps:

(a) maintaining a table of English domain names with corresponding multi-lingual

(non-English) domain names (*col. 7, In 11-67, converting/mapping Hebrew resource*

identifiers to conventional resource identifiers (English) using mapping databases);

(b) examining an incoming Domain Name to determine if it is an English Domain

Name (*the operation of figure 1 and/or col. 2, line 62 to col. 3, line 4, only conventional*

(English) URL is used in accessing resources on the Internet); if so, sending said

English Domain to an Internet Domain Name Server for resolution on the Internet (*col.*

2, line 62 to col. 3, accessing resources on the Internet using conventional (English)

URL);

(c) examining the incoming Domain Name to determine if it is a non-English

multi-lingual Domain Name (*the operation of figure 1 or col. 4, lines 28-67, particularly*

lines 56-62, Hebrew URL is converted to conventional URL (English URL)); if so,

replacing said non-English Domain Name by a known English Domain Name (*col. 4,*

lines 56-62 and referring to figures 4-5, replacing Hebrew URL with English URL); and

wherein said English Domain Name is sent out to an Internet Domain Name System for

resolution on the Internet (*col. 2, line 62 to col. 3, accessing resources on the Internet*

using conventional (English) URL);

6.   Regarding claims 2-5 and 29-31, Abir further discloses the method of claim 1

further comprising the step of: utilizing the Internet as the Internet (*within scope of*

reference), utilizing Unicode as the multi-language character set coding system (*within*

scope of reference), utilizing a separate ML-DNS system in parallel with current DNS

systems (*English and non-English databases are in association as referred by mapping*

in col. 7, lines 16-67), utilizing a ML-DN string format similar to the existing English DN

format, but with a character set equal to an extended character set which consists of all

the characters in Unicode except for special reserved symbols including "." and "@"

(*within scope of reference, English includes all Latin characters, Arabic numbers, and*

conventional signs including "." and "@").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 6-15, 28-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Abir (US 6738827).

9.   Regarding claims 6 and 32, Abir discloses a method for mapping existing (English) domain names of an Internet system to multi-lingual (non-English) domain names comprising the steps of:

(a) maintaining a table of multi-lingual (non-English) domain names with corresponding English domain names (*col. 7, ln 11-67, converting/mapping Hebrew resource identifiers to conventional resource identifiers (English) using mapping databases*);

(b) examining the incoming Domain Name to determine if it is an non-English multi-lingual Domain Name (*the operation of figure 1 and/or col. 2, line 62 to col. 3, line 4, determining if Hebrew is input*); if so, replacing said non-English Domain Name by a known English Domain Name (*col. 4, lines 56-62 and referring to figures 4-5, replacing Hebrew URL with English URL*); and wherein said English Domain Name is sent out to an Internet Domain Name System for resolution on the Internet (*col. 2, line 62 to col. 3, accessing resources on the Internet using conventional (English) URL*);

Abir fails to specifically disclose the step of sending said Domain Name to a non-English multi-lingual Internet Domain Name Server for resolution on an Internet if it is determined that the incoming Domain Name is of a non-English multi-lingual Domain Name; (c) examining the incoming Domain Name to determine if it is an English Domain Name; if so, replacing said English Domain Name by a known non-English multi-lingual Domain Name wherein said multi-lingual Domain Name corresponds to the English Domain Name; (d) sending said non-English multi-lingual Domain Name to a non-English multi-lingual Internet Domain Name System for resolution on an internet.

However, Pan et al. teach a system having multiple search engines, wherein each said search engine accepts only query terms in a particular dedicated language (*English and Chinese are two examples of dedicated languages for "yahoo" and "sina" search engines, respectively, col. 8, lines 33-40*). So, when a search query in English is inputted to "Sina" search engine, the English query is then converted to Chinese for execution of the search on "Sina" search engine. And likewise, when query in Chinese is inputted for search in Yahoo search engine, said Chinese query must first be converted to English (*referring to Pan et al. reference*).

Since Abir and Pan et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Abir and Pan et al. in order to enable users speaking different languages to access resources on the Internet via search engines using a different dedicated language.

10.   Regarding claims 11, 35, 39, and 46, Abir discloses a method and system for mapping multi-lingual (non-English) domain names to existing domain names of an Internet network system and for mapping existing domain names of the Internet system to multi-lingual (non-English) domain names comprising the steps:

(a) maintaining a table of English domain names with a corresponding multi-lingual (non-English) domain names (*col. 7, ln 11-67, converting/transforming/mapping Hebrew resource identifiers to conventional resource identifiers (English) using mapping databases*);

(b) maintaining a table of multi-lingual (non-English) domain names with corresponding English domain names (*col. 7, ln 11-67, transforming or mapping Hebrew resource identifiers to conventional resource identifiers (English) using mapping databases*);

(c) resolving for an English-required Domain Name portion of an internet, further comprising the steps of:

(i) examining an incoming Domain Name to determine if it is an English Domain Name (*the operation of figure 1 and/or col. 2, line 62 to col. 3, line 4, only conventional (English) URL is used in accessing resources on the Internet*); if so, sending said English Domain to an Internet Domain Name Server for resolution on the Internet (*col. 2, line 62 to col. 3, accessing resources on the Internet using conventional (English) URL*);

(ii) examining the incoming Domain Name to determine if it is a non-English multi-lingual Domain Name (*the operation of figure 1 or col. 4, lines 28-67, particularly lines 56-62, Hebrew URL is converted to conventional URL (English URL)*); wherein said non-English Domain Name is replaced by a known English Domain Name which corresponds to the multi-lingual non-English Domain Name (*col. 4, lines 56-62 and referring to figures 4-5, replacing Hebrew URL with English URL*); and wherein said English Domain Name is sent out to an Internet Domain Name System for resolution on the Internet (*col. 2, line 62 to col. 3, accessing resources on the Internet using conventional (English) URL*).

(d) resolving for an a non-English multi-lingual Domain Name-required portion of an internet, further comprising the steps of:

(iv) examining the incoming Domain Name to determine if it is an non-English multi-lingual Domain Name (*the operation of figure 1 and/or col. 2, line 62 to col. 3, line 4, determining if Hebrew is input*); if so, replacing said non-English Domain Name by a known English Domain Name (*col. 4, lines 56-62 and referring to figures 4-5, replacing Hebrew URL with English URL*); and wherein said English Domain Name is sent out to an Internet Domain Name System for resolution on the Internet (*col. 2, line 62 to col. 3, accessing resources on the Internet using conventional (English) URL*).

Abir fails to specifically disclose the step of sending said Domain Name to a non-English multi-lingual Internet Domain Name Server for resolution on an Internet if it is determined that the incoming Domain Name is of a non-English multi-lingual Domain Name; (c) examining the incoming Domain Name to determine if it is an English Domain Name; if so, replacing said English Domain Name by a known non-English multi-lingual Domain Name wherein said multi-lingual Domain Name corresponds to the English Domain Name; (d) sending said non-English multi-lingual Domain Name to a non-English multi-lingual Internet Domain Name System for resolution on an internet.

However, Pan et al. teach a system having multiple search engines, wherein each said search engine accepts only query terms in a particular dedicated language (*English and Chinese are two examples of dedicated languages for "yahoo" and "sina"*

search engines, respectively, col. 8, lines 33-40). So, when a search query in English is inputted to "Sina" search engine, the English query is then converted to Chinese for execution of the search on "Sina" search engine. And likewise, when query in Chinese is inputted for search in Yahoo search engine, said Chinese query must first be converted to English *(referring to Pan et al. reference).*

Since Abir and Pan et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Abir and Pan et al. in order to enable users speaking different languages to access resources on the Internet via search engines using a different dedicated language.

11.   Regarding claims 7-10, 12-15, 33-34, 36-38, 40-41, and 47-48, Abir further discloses the step of: utilizing the Internet as the Internet *(within scope of reference),* utilizing Unicode as the multi-language character set coding system *(within scope of reference),* utilizing a separate ML-DNS system in parallel with current DNS systems *(English and non-English databases are in association as referred by mapping in col. 7, lines 16-67),* utilizing a ML-DN string format similar to the existing English DN format, but with a character set equal to an extended character set which consists of all the characters in Unicode except for special reserved symbols including "." and "@" *(within scope of reference, English includes all Latin characters, Arabic numbers, and conventional signs including "." and "@").*

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. (US 6119078), (US 6418402), and (6425003) are considered pertinent to the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen X. Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HXV   7/5/2006

***

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER